



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/657,621	09/08/2003	Richard Lee Sanders	18279	9447

23556 7590 07/19/2005

KIMBERLY-CLARK WORLDWIDE, INC.
401 NORTH LAKE STREET
NEENAH, WI 54956

EXAMINER

NOLAND, KENNETH W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3653

DATE MAILED: 07/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/657,621	SANDERS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kenneth W. Noland	3653	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12-12-03, 10-04-04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

Art Unit: 3653

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1,5,8,10,11,17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tramontina in view of Mott et al. Tramontina discloses in figure 7 the housing to hold paper products having the partial housing wall 224 and the dispensing opening 232 . Note in figure 9 the cartridge 262 having a viewing window 282.

Tramontina discloses in column 10, lines44-49, that the cartridge would receive the biasing means 262 of figure 6 to bias the paper products towards the opening. To modify Tramontina 's biasing means for one having an external spring and a member to extend through a slot of the housing would be obvious in view of the teachings of Mott et al which discloses in figures 4 and 5 the use of the external spring 60 having the member 45 extending through the slot 35 of the housing to effect biasing of the product so that more space for the product would be effected for dispensing by the dispenser.

3. *Claims 2,3,4 *** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tramontina in view of Mott et al* as applied to claims 1,5,8,10,11,17 and 19*** above, and further in view of Tramontina et al(docket no 19265.1). To provide that the dispensing opening of Tramontina has a hinged door would be obvious in view of the teachings of Tramontina et al (docket no 19265.1) which shows in figure 4 the hinged door 34 with dispensing opening to effect a better refill of the product into the housing.**.

Art Unit: 3653

4. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tramontina in view of Mott et al** as applied to claims 1,5,8,10,11,17 and 19*** above, and further in view of *Hein . To provide that Tramontina et al's springs for a 'track' to receive the springs would be obvious in view of the teachings of Hein's use of the 'track' members 28 in figure 3 to receive the biasing springs and which track members extend along the housing so as to provide for the guiding and protection of the springs.**.

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(g)(1) during the course of an interference conducted under section 135 or section 291, another inventor involved therein establishes, to the extent permitted in section 104, that before such person's invention thereof the invention was made by such other inventor and not abandoned, suppressed, or concealed, or (2) before such person's invention thereof, the invention was made in this country by another inventor who had not abandoned, suppressed, or concealed it. In determining priority of invention under this subsection, there shall be considered not only the respective dates of conception and reduction to practice of the invention, but also the reasonable diligence of one who was first to conceive and last to reduce to practice, from a time prior to conception by the other.

6. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(*g**) as being *anticipated** by **Tramontina et al (pub no 2004/0206768). Tramontina et al discloses in the drawings and in the specification every claimed feature of claims 1-20.

7. *.

(f) he did not himself invent the subject matter sought to be patented.

8. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) because the applicant did not invent the claimed subject matter. *In regard to this, there is a question whether the inventors (Sanders and Lee) of the present application invented the invention disclosed

Art Unit: 3653

when compared to the Publication no. 2004/0206768 which also discloses the same invention but having different inventors to Tramontina and Le Cates..**.

9. Claims 1-20 are directed to the same invention as that of claims 1 and 2*** of commonly assigned *Publication no. 2004/0206768**. The issue of priority under 35 U.S.C. 102(g) and possibly 35 U.S.C. 102(f) of this single invention must be resolved.

Since the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office normally will not institute an interference between applications or a patent and an application of common ownership (see MPEP § 2302), the assignee is required to state which entity is the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter. A terminal disclaimer has no effect in this situation since the basis for refusing more than one patent is priority of invention under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) and not an extension of monopoly.

Failure to comply with this requirement will result in a holding of abandonment of this application.

10. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

11. Claims 1,12,17,18,19 and 20 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1 and 2*** of copending Application No.

Art Unit: 3653

*10/657,386 (Pub. no.2004/0206768)**. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth W. Noland whose telephone number is (571) 272-6941. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday ,each week.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Donald Walsh can be reached on (703) 306-4173. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kenneth W. Noland 7/12/2005
KENNETH W. NOLAND
PRIMARY EXAMINER